

The Times-Dispatch
DAILY-WEEKLY-SUNDAY.

Business Office: 115 E. Main Street
Richmond, Va.
Telephone Bureau: 109 N. N. Street
Lynchburg Bureau: 215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. One Six Three One
POSTAGE PAID. Year, \$3.00. Mo., .25.
Daily without Sunday, 4.00. 2.50. 1.50. .75.
Sunday edition only, 2.00. 1.50. .75. .25.
Weekly (Wednesday), 1.00. .50. .25. .10.

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service
in Richmond (and suburbs), Manchester
and Petersburg—

One Week
Daily with Sunday, 14 cents
Daily without Sunday, 10 cents
Sunday only, 5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond,
Va., as second-class matter under act of
Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1910.

ONE-GALLS WOMEN.

The National American Woman Suffrage Association is holding its forty-second annual convention in Washington. There are seven hundred delegates in attendance. The Rev. Dr. Anna Shaw is president of the Association. She is a fine woman. Nearly all of the members are fine women, except the twelve men who are present, and they are doubtless fine men, as men go. But there are some opallus or one-garter ladies present and they made their presence felt Thursday night when they hissed the President of the United States. He had been invited to attend the convention and bid the Association welcome to the National Capital, and never dreaming for a moment that he would be insulted by the women who had invited him, or by their associates, he accepted their invitation, and accepted it against the protest of equally good women who are opposed to woman suffrage. He will know better next time, although we hope that he will not suffer himself to make any change in his very reasonable views on the suffrage question because of the ungentlemanly conduct of the wallflowers who behaved as badly as any of the rednecks and hillbillies who have brought manhood suffrage into merited contempt in Arkansas, not to mention the unseemly demonstrations of the wool-hat gang in other Southern States and the sand-lot crowd who followed Dennis Kearney on the Pacific.

Mr. Taft, however, has nothing to regret about the incident which came very near being a solar plexus for the Suffragists of the Shaw school, that is to say, if any body of women working for equal rights could be charged with the possession of such a spot in their make-up. After telling the committee which invited him to attend the opening session of the convention that he did not believe in all the things for which they contend, and being assured by the committee that he was to have a free swing, he was over-persuaded to make his appearance, and no sooner did he say something which some members of the convention did not understand, but which they imagined was an insult to their masculinity, than they began to hiss, after the manner of the goose. After saying that "on the whole every intelligent class which is really intelligent knows its own interests and is better qualified to determine those interests shall be cared for than any other class, no matter how altruistic," Mr. Taft added:

"The class should as a whole care enough to look after its interests. It takes part in a vote in the exercise of political power if it is conferred. Now, if it does not care enough for this, then it seems to me that the danger is, if the power is conferred, that it may be exercised by that part of the class least desirable as political constituents and be neglected by many of those who are intelligent and patriotic and would be most desirable as members of the electorate."

Mr. Taft proved his point: for it was just as he finished this perfectly clear and reasonable statement that the geese began to hiss, thus proving beyond the peradventure of a doubt that they certainly could not be safely entrusted with the exercise of suffrage which requires any degree of intelligence. We are not surprised that their more self-respecting associates in the convention should have been greatly humiliated by their conduct. The behavior of the hissing geese, however, ought not to be laid up against the cause, any more than the riotous conduct of the ignorant and irresponsible who participate in men's assemblies should be regarded as ground for denying the suffrage to men. The incident only proved that there are wool-hats in petticoats as well as in breeches.

Mr. Taft deserves to be congratulated upon his fine conduct in a somewhat embarrassing situation, and his rebuke was the finest thing that he has done for many a day. It was at the same time one of the hardest blows that has yet been given to the Movement for equal rights.

MARK TWAIN IS ILL.

Every man who loves an honest laugh will be sorry to hear that Mark Twain is seriously ill and that some of his physicians fear the great humorist's end is near. When he landed at New York Thursday on his return from the Bermudas, he had to be carried ashore; and from his home at Redding, Connecticut, comes news that all hope that he will ever be his old self again has been abandoned.

Mark Twain occupies a unique niche in literature and holds a place which no living man can fill, should Mark die. He is a professional humorist who is a natural humorist, and his stories always excite laughter because Mark himself has laughed through life; but for all of this, he does not rely solely upon the bolshoi humor of the situations he devises or the novel character of the stories he

writes. He has real literary ability and can sketch a character with as rare skill as any living writer. Huckleberry Finn, for instance, which is perhaps Twain's greatest work, is a novel of delicious humor and unusual interest, but it is a character study from beginning to end and is rich in figures which have become a part of the literary inheritance of the day.

We shall have still finer things to say about Twain if he should die; but we think the American people will sorrow with him in his illness and will regret the old age which has stopped his cunning pen. The world of humor is less pungent when he does not write.

IF NOT GORDON, THEN WHO?

If Police Commissioner Douglas Gordon is not a proper person to arrest a dangerous maniac on the streets, who is? If a man whose duty it is to enforce the police regulations and to see that the police do their work, should not act when the police are not at hand, who can arrest an offender? If a Police Commissioner is to be interfered with when he tries to subdue an armed and crazed man, in the act of attacking a defenseless citizen, why should a police officer, subordinate to the commissioner, be authorized to arrest a man in the street, contrary to the wishes of private individuals?

These questions were apparently answered the wrong way yesterday afternoon under the shed of the Mutual Building, when Commissioner Gordon attempted to subdue a man who was threatening the life of Councilman Garber and flourishing a vicious-looking knife in the streets. A number of men, some of them prominent in the city, and one of them a member of the Board of Aldermen, interposed when the Police Commissioner attempted to disarm the man and hold him for the police. By their action these men frowned upon the proper maintenance of the law and interfered with a sworn officer of the law who was doing the duty which any citizen may be called upon to do at any time. But for the cooler judgment of men who came up the Police Commissioner might have been forced to free a man whose action threatened murder to all whom he met.

The laws must be upheld. If the commissioner is not to be permitted to do so, who is? If not Gordon, then who?

RAILROAD OPPRESSION.

"One of these fine days," says the Salisbury (N. C.) Post, "legislation will be enacted in this State (North Carolina), unless the railroads exercise common sense and give simple justice in the matter of freight rates, beside which a 2-1-4 cent passenger rate will be as a speck compared to a cyclone, and if any hardship is worked the railroads will have only themselves to blame." The Charlotte Observer, usually a sane and conservative newspaper—at least, that was its reputation when the "old man" was on deck, God spare his life and give him increasing strength of both body and mind—echoes the excitement of its neighbor, and declares that "the patience with which the people of North Carolina have endured this oppression is almost as wonderful as the extent of the oppression itself." We have not the least idea what all this means; but we should like to know both the nature and extent of the "oppression" before joining in the hue and cry against the railroads.

It will not be denied, we believe, that the railroads have done more for the people of North Carolina than the people of North Carolina have done for the railroads—the railroads have certainly made a full return to the State for such privileges as the State has given the railroads. A. R. Andrews, a North Carolinian, and first vice-president of the Southern Railway, has done more for the material development of North Carolina than all the newspapers and politicians and boards of trade and commercial organizations in the State put together. He was working for the State before the war and he has been steadily "on the job" ever since the war closed forty years ago. There is nothing that he could do that he has not done. Through his active agency towns have been built, factories established, the immigration of desirable people encouraged and transportation facilities increased until now North Carolina is doing more business than was ever dreamed of in its flightiest moments. The people ride in better cars than they ever had before, there are better stations than ever and the convenience and comfort of the travelling public have been considered at every turn. Besides, the freight rates have actually been reduced almost to the point of absolute loss on the service. Of course, there are community "grievances," as they are called, and "discriminations," but in the very nature of things they are unavoidable in the management of a great system serving so many communities and so varied interests. Manifestly, it would not be practicable for the railroads to give port rates to interior points or to change their "basin points" at the behest of every town in the State.

This appears to be a reasonable view to take of the situation of which complaint has been made; but if the people of North Carolina will only stop to think about it a minute, they will find that, speaking generally, their interests have not been wholly neglected by their railroads. A little actual comparison of freight rates and passenger rates now with what they were ten or fifteen or twenty years ago will show that the people are receiving now better service and at a lower cost to them than they have ever known. As matter of fact, the railroad freight rates in the United States are lower than the rates in any other country in the world, and we believe that they are lower in North Carolina than ever

before; that they have been "cut to the bone." We believe that, in spite of the fact that the cotton growers have received this year more for their staple than in any year since the high prices of the '80's, the railroads have not demanded any increase in the charge for carriage. We should like, of course, to have Salisbury and Charlotte put on a parity with Wilmington, and all natural advantages obliterated for the benefit of less fortunately situated communities, but the "thus saith the Lord" is mightier than legislative decrees and made-up conditions for the stirring up of "popular indignation."

Railroads are business enterprises and are run to make money, just like some newspapers and factories and farms. When, overwhelmed by the sense of "oppression" the State, in the exercise of its power of eminent domain, has whittled down the earning capacity of the roads below the cost of operation plus a fair return upon the capital invested, the State should go a step further and actually proceed with the confiscation of the property. We have no doubt that there are some roads in North Carolina which their present owners would be glad to sell to the State at cost without asking any questions. Of course, the railroads ought to be regulated; but there is a point beyond which regulation amounts practically to confiscation.

"AS A POLITICAL ASSET."

At the recent conference of the superintendents and field workers of the Anti-Saloon League of the Southern States in Atlanta this resolution was adopted:

"That our people are warned against the efforts of designing politicians to use the Anti-Saloon League as a political asset. We must not allow our organization to be drawn into side issues which are not directly involved in our fight against the liquor traffic."

There has been some effort to make it appear that the advice given in the report of the legislative committee of the Anti-Saloon League of this State did not accurately set forth the purposes of the League; but a comparison of the recommendation made by the legislative committee and the resolution adopted by the conference in Atlanta would seem to show that the League has determined upon a fight all along the line, "regardless of personal and political affiliations."

There is one statement in the Atlanta resolution which would appear to have special bearing upon the situation in Virginia: "Our people are warned against the efforts of designing politicians to use the Anti-Saloon League as a political asset." That the promoters of the movement in this State have some purpose in view other than the mere holding of an election on the State-wide prohibition question does not admit longer of serious doubt. The meat of the movement is politics, not temperance. The same thing has been done before in other States, and the warning sent from Atlanta "against the efforts of designing politicians to use the Anti-Saloon League as a political asset" should open the eyes of all the Democrats of this State to the danger of any sort of co-operation with the plans of the League.

HOW THE ENGLISH DO IT.

The English are a fighting folk, but they always do their fighting according to their own methods. They form hollow squares on the hill around Waterloo, or they send 600 men against 60,000 in a foolhardy charge at a Russian redoubt, or they marshal their forces in a thin line of battle in the Sudan with as much show and as much bravado as any nation; but when they prepare for a political revolution they eschew bloodshed, bury the tomahawk, and go about it in a fashion that should excite the admiration of every nation. There is nothing that is hurried, nothing that is warlike and little that is bitter. By a general election, a series of debates and a number of resolutions they shake the very foundation of their government and work changes which, in another country, would be the signal for years of war.

England is at present in the midst of a momentous revolution. Nothing like it has been seen in Europe since the convocation of the Estates General, and nothing like it has been witnessed in England since the Prince of Orange rode into power at the head of London Burghesses and sanctioned the Bill of Rights. The most exciting hours of the debates on the Napoleonic wars and the most stormy scenes of Gladstone's home-rule debates never equalled, in their bearing upon the government of the country, the debates which are now in progress in the Commons.

In the midst of all this change, the method of revolution is marvelously simple. Baked by the Lords in their attempt to pass a revolutionary budget, the Commons appealed to the country. The result of the elections convinced the Liberals that they had the support of a majority of the people, and they are now carrying through their policy, bit by bit, with the precision of a well-oiled machine. Premier Asquith first outlined his policy, gave the opposition in both houses an opportunity to reply, and then, without delay, asked the Commons to approve his plan to reduce the power of the Lords. This was done on Thursday night, after a heated debate. Nothing remains now but to introduce measures which carry out the spirit of the resolutions, which have already been approved, and to get the formal consent of the Commons to principles which that body has already sanctioned.

The issue will then be in the hands of the Lords, who represent the opposite interest to that now dominant in the Commons. While the Lords, by their own action, have practically surrendered their hereditary right to sit as an Upper House, they will probably protest against Premier Asquith's bills and may even reject them. In such an event the well-ordered Constitution

will meet the situation and will provide means for carrying through the will of the Commons without excitement or bloodshed. The Premier, following ancient precedents, will ask the King to appoint new Liberal Lords to overcome the majority of the Unionists in the Upper House. The King, under the Constitution, will be forced to accede to the Premier's request and will appoint new peers. It will then be only a question of a few days before the Lords will yield and the Constitution of the Empire will be transformed.

The success of the whole revolution will depend upon one thing only—the ability of the Premier to maintain his majority in the Commons. As long as his fusion of Liberals, Nationalists and Laborites remains true to his call, nothing can defeat his purpose. The King is impotent, the Lords are helpless. There can be no appeal to the country. The moment he loses his majority, however, the people of the Empire will have an opportunity to pass on his measures and to approve or to disapprove the action of the men who refuse to follow the Government leader. In this way the will of the people can always be accurately registered and the Constitution can always be changed, as it shows the need of amendment, within the course of a few months.

Our American Constitution is an admirable one and is worthy of much of the praise bestowed upon it; but it is not as nearly perfect as England's. Congress cannot represent the popular will as accurately or as promptly as the English Parliament can, and the people cannot make necessary changes in the organic law without a long struggle. It may not be desirable to change the foundation upon which the government rests with every passing administration, but it is desirable to have a Constitution which can register the approved will of the people from generation to generation without the subterfuge of judicial decisions or extra-legal executive orders.

SUPPORT THE CONGRESS.

At its meeting on Friday the Chamber of Commerce gave a hearing to the representative of the Southern Commercial Congress. After Edward L. Quarles, the secretary of the congress, had addressed the meeting and explained the objects of that body, the business men of the city were prompt to pledge their support, and adopted a formal resolution to that effect.

This is as it should be. The work is a good one and ought to be approved on principle. The value of the chamber's action, however, will depend upon whether or not the members of the chamber appreciate how such a work as that undertaken by the Southern Commercial Congress will be of value to Richmond. As long as our business men feel that the movement is of general value only, in that it will help the progress of the South and will advertise its resources, they will lend their measure their formal support and little more; but when they understand that the Southern Commercial Congress can and will help Richmond, the work of the congress will appeal to them in a more conclusive manner.

The progress of the South means the progress of every community in the South. This much is axiomatic. Every community which shares in advertising the South and in bringing settlers to the country must, in the end, benefit by the new immigration; but Richmond's gain by co-operation in this work will be far greater. This city occupies a strategic point in the South, and will gain perhaps as much from the general progress of this section as any single city in the South. We supply a large jobbing territory; we have manufacturing industries which sell in the markets of every Southern city. As the wealth of the South is multiplied and as its population is increased, our field of operations will be increased and our every business will prosper accordingly.

No city can gain more from the work of the Commercial Congress, and no city should support it more liberally.

LEAVE ROCKEFELLER ALONE.

While Congressmen are looking the Rockefeller gift horse in the mouth, some of the newspapers seem inclined to reflect the animal altogether, and are urging Congress to refuse Mr. Rockefeller a Federal charter for his proposed Foundation. The Los Angeles Herald, which appears to be most blatant in its protest, is raising an outcry against the chartering of the Foundation on the ground that the act of Congress allowing Rockefeller to keep his millions and to establish his family, as it says, "as firmly as any European privileged family is established on concession, foundation or hereditary transmission of unearned wealth or title."

This strikes us as capricious criticism. Mr. Rockefeller may not be a model as a scrupulous financier, and the method of his corporation may not be creditable or even honest, but Mr. Rockefeller has evidenced the sincerity of his philanthropy in charities which are almost unexcelled in the history of the world. To allege that a man who has honestly given so much to the uplifting of American public institutions wishes to seek the protection of a Federal law for the perpetuation of his great fortune, when he expresses a directly opposite intention, is beyond legitimate criticism.

Besides, if Mr. Rockefeller wanted to keep all his money, why did he need a Federal foundation to do so? He has only three children and but one son. The three live in perfect accord, as we understand it, and could certainly keep the Rockefeller fortune together if they so desired. No other force of law could deprive them of the money their father has made, and no income tax could seriously reduce the bulk of Mr. Rockefeller's great estate. If Mr. Rockefeller wanted to keep his money for the establishment of a

great American family, he would only have to draw his will carefully, pay his taxes and appoint his executors, as any other private citizen. He would have no need in the world for a Federal Foundation to keep what no one can take away from him.

In some of the criticisms of Mr. Rockefeller's proposed Foundation there are the usual remarks about tainted money and about the impropriety of a man being a "benefactor" when he may also be a violator of State and Federal laws, and as such may be subject to fine and imprisonment. Here, again, it seems to us, common sense, common decency and a modicum of charity would have prevented such personal attacks. The Standard Oil may have violated the statutes of the States in which it has been indicted, and it has probably done business contrary to the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust law; but if Mr. Rockefeller, the man, wishes to make amends for what Mr. Rockefeller, the financier, has done, we think the American people should meet him half way.

Criticism of public characters and of public acts is legitimate. Without it government would soon be endangered and men in positions of trust would soon become reckless; but carping criticism and senseless suspicion of everything done by a rich man is neither necessary for the welfare of society nor profitable for the critics.

In trying to figure out who started the hissing in the woman's convention at Washington, don't forget that there were twelve men delegates in the convention. Probably it was the men, after all, who made the break. It would have been just like them.

The women found out at Washington on Thursday that it is never safe to monkey with the elephant.

"Dope about Houston" is the anty descriptive term employed by the Charlotte Observer in paying its compliments to the recent wool pulp exhibit made by the Houston Post.

Bryan must be pretty hard put for "paramount issues" if he has gone to Porto Rico to find them.

Jack Cudahy and his wife have made it up, thanks to the intervention of the young man's father. Jack is speeding back home, determined to renew that sweet domestic dream so rudely broken by Lillie. Mrs. Cudahy, we presume, has withdrawn her declaration that she would never live with Jack, although she had no objection to living in the house Jack built. This is fine for the Cudahys, but it is hard on Lillie. What has he to console himself with now that Jack has come into his own again?

The census figures will be fine front page copy as it is, but how much more interesting they would be if the things our neighbors say about us could be made a part of M. Durand's veracious volumes.

Six men have died from poisoned whiskey in Rhode Island. We feel sorry for the men, but we are not surprised at any results which may follow the drinking of Rhode Island whiskey.

Still, Uncle Joe made Congress pay his garage bill, so what complaint has he? There are some things better than being Speaker.

Ten switchmen have been arrested for robbing railroad trains in Kansas City; but the city need not hope to get into the papers with a fly-blown sensation as that. Since Lillie went away people do not take much stock in Kansas City anyway.

"It takes a man to be unpopular," says Chancellor Day; but his own record disproves his argument.

An Englishman drove 804 miles in a cab from Interlaken to Cannes, and will walk the rest of his life to pay for the trip.

Bishop Nichols, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in California, has given up the Emmanuel movement as a failure. He says it does not work for the cure of neurasthenics, and cities cases where he tried the mental treatment in San Francisco hospitals without result. This is more of an indication that the Bishop was not right than that the Emmanuel movement was wrong. The last place in the world to try such a treatment would be a hospital where patients are already surrounded with things to remind them of distress and where they are quick to imagine themselves sick even when they are well. The Emmanuel movement may not be all that its friends think it is, but its collapse must be proved in some other way than that suggested by the good Bishop.

In celebration of his twenty-fifth birthday, the Houston Post illustrated its first page with a horrible picture made up of a group of remarkable looking women; scantily attired. The figure of "Houston" is particularly brazen, but she is doubtless drawn true to life. It "pears like" as they say in Texas, that the lady representing the Lone Star State has a creak in her left knee as if she were a little doubtful whether or not she could reach the birthday cake, blazing with twenty-five candles, on the side. The picture is not in a very important sense true to life, however, because there is neither jug nor punch-bowl in sight, and no birthday in Texas is ever complete without both. There is another feature of this oil painting which is out of touch with the truth—the ladies present all being represented as having very small feet, which, of course, is not possible in Texas. There is, however, one thing that must be said about them—none of them appears to have on any stockings, and that, of course, is a Texas.

The Greensboro Record probably knows that the crawfish is one of the most interesting and instructive of the crustaceans, and that he is never so interesting and instructive as when he is going backward or sideways. The crawfish has sense enough to get away with dignity and a reasonable degree of dispatch in times of emergency. With him, as with all reasoning beings, discretion is always the better part of valor.

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

A Market for Tin Foil.

Kindly tell me if there is a place to sell tin foil. If so, please let me know where.
R. D. N.
There is no appreciable demand at present for tin foil.

Times-Dispatch Premium Contest.

Please print in your paper all the premiums offered for household coupons, and how much cash will have to accompany each?
F. M.
The following premiums will be kept in stock until May 2:
For thirty consecutive premiums and \$2.50 in cash, or \$2.50, if the article is to be expressed, one set of handsomely plated knives and forks, six to a set. For the same amount of money, one set of handsomely plated R. C. C. spoons, including six tablespoons, six teaspoons and a butter knife.
For thirty consecutive coupons and \$1.25 in cash, or \$1.25, if sent by express, a Venetian art lamp fitted for electricity or gas, or a handsome library lamp fitted for gas.

For thirty consecutive coupons and \$1 in cash, or \$1, if sent by express, a mission wall clock, 12x30.
For thirty consecutive coupons and 50 cents in cash, or \$1.15 if sent by express, one art brass clock.
Coupons will be discontinued on April 23, though they will be redeemed as late as May 2.

Both Sides of a Debate.

We are to have a debate in our school soon—"Resolved, That the South offers greater opportunities to the home-seeker than the North." Please give me all the points you can on the affirmative.

We are to have a debate here soon—"Resolved, That the South offers greater opportunities to the home-seeker than the North." Please give me all the points you can on the affirmative.

It looks as though we are to have the debate in this column. Here are some of the reasons why the South offers greater opportunity than does the North:
The soil of the South is in the main

more fertile than the soil of the North. It gives an assurance to the home-seeker of greater profits from agricultural pursuits than he could secure in the North. Again, lands in the South are much cheaper than they are in the North and can be secured in large quantities at very reasonable rates. Then, too, the South offers a greater field for diversified crops with consequent advantage to the home-seeker. It is possible, also, in various sections of the South to find an advantage in crop that can be raised in temperate and in subtropical climates. Finally, the price of labor is cheaper in the South than in the North. There are several reasons why the North is a better field for the home-seeker than the South. In the first place, the North is a richer section at present. Money can be made more rapidly than in the South, and the home-seeker is assured a ready and immediate market for all that he can produce, whether it be farm products or manufactured articles. In the second place, wages are higher in the North, which is an advantage to a man of simple means who wishes to secure a menial position. In the third place, some authorities are to be believed, the educational advantage of the North are greater and transportation is more rapid and easier.

"Dieu Vos Garde."
Please tell me the meaning of "Dieu Vos Garde."
X. Y. Z.
God keep you.

Times-Dispatch Premium Contest.
Please state what premiums you have now, and if you have any china.

Our premium department has at present only the lamps in stock, but will secure china, silverware and clocks as the opportunity offers next week. No other premiums can be had.

Bank Laws.
To settle a dispute, please tell me whether it is against the laws of Virginia to draw a check for any amount less than \$1. If there is, please state the penalty, and if not, No. You probably have in mind the report which was circulated some months ago to the effect that under a recent act of Congress no check could be drawn on a national bank for less than \$1. This report proved to be ill founded. You can draw a check for 1 cent if you so desire.

PRINCESS COMES TO BELGIAN LEGATION

BY LA MARQUE DE FORTENY.

PRINCE HENRI DE LIGNE, secretary of the Belgian legation at Washington, after a very brief stay over here, during which he attended the wedding of Prince de Saxe, of Brussels, to Miss Marie Logan, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, returned to Europe in order to settle the arrangements for his own marriage, which took place on Thursday last in Paris. His bride, who expects to bring to this country in addition to the foreign diplomatic corps at Washington—is Princess Charlotte de Tremolle, eldest daughter of the Prince de Tarente et de Talmont, and who is himself the only son and heir of the tenth Duc de la Tremolle, of the Thaurin family, which is one of the European aristocracy can only trace their descent through the female line from the founders of their families and others, and the Prince de Tarente, this particular duke is able to show an unbroken male line back to the Duke of Burgundy, the first Duke of the kingdom of Thaurin was conferred upon the house in 1553, the dukedom of Tremolle, forty years ago, Louis XV, granted the title of Prince de Tarente to the eldest son and the rank of prince and princess to all the other members of the family. The Duke's abandonment of his rights to the succession of the throne of Naples, acquired by the marriage of Francis de la Tremolle with Anne of Aragon, and the present duke is seventy-two years of age, and his father and immediate predecessor was one of the pages of King Louis XIV. and Queen Marie Antoinette, and a man of twenty at the time of their execution. Indeed, two of the brothers of the late duke, namely, the Abbe de la Tremolle and the Prince de Talmont, were guillotined during the days of the Terror, for their part in the execution of Laval, where his head was stuck on a pike at the city gate. The duke is a member of the Institute of France, and his election to the services which he has rendered to history. His latest work bears the title, "My Grandfather and the Revolution of 1789," and is a most interesting and important work in question, superbly bound and adorned with the most beautiful illustrations, and is a work of great value, at the expense of the duke, who is very rich, and its distribution was limited to the libraries of the French Republic, and the libraries of national institutions, both in France and abroad. In the case of his other books, the information came from the duke's family archives, which constitute an inexhaustible mine of riches to the historian, a fact which will be readily admitted when it is known that among his papers are the daily accounts of the Duc de la Tremolle from 1812 to 1815, without interruption, showing how a French nobleman lived from day to day, what were his revenues and what were his expenses during the changes of fortune which France underwent through the whole of the intervening period.

The duke is a tall, stately man, a fine type of the French grand seigneur of the old school, who, without being the least bit cynical or narrow-minded, has held aloof from public life, of which he has retained throughout an interested spectator. While proud of his family and mindful of the fact that his genealogical tree is a most interesting one, he is not a devotee of the various reigning dynasties of Europe, and that prior to the surrender by the French nobility to the Revolution, he had owned 600 Potpourri lands, did homage to the Duc de la Tremolle of the day, he is not in the least degree arrogant, his manners are simple and almost kindly, simplicity and absence of all hauteur and affectation, while, unlike so many of his fellow-nobles, he does not entertain an exalted sense of terms of friendship with such people as the Rothschilds, and members of their race, who have been respected for their motives. Indeed, the late Alphonse Rothschild was among his warmest friends.

He makes his home when in the country at the Chateau de Serrant, a grand old place in the Department of Maine-et-Loire, built in 1546, by the same architect who designed the chateau of Chenonceaux in the Loire valley, the Chateau de Serrant is a spacious courtyard, towers and wings, surrounded by a moat, dominates the Valley of the Loire, between Angers and Nantes. The chapel contains the famous tomb of Marechal de Vauban, in black marble, which is justly regarded as the masterpiece of Coyseux. The chateau, early in the eighteenth century, through its purchase by Francis James Walsh, an Irish nobleman, passed into the hands of the Walshes, Irish Jacobites, who, after the deposition of King James II., fled to England and the Battle of the Boyne, secured letters of marque from him, authorizing them to fit out privateers to prey upon and destroy the shipping of France. The Walshes, however, were not recognized by England, and to compensate him for this, King Louis

XIV. created him Comte de Serrant. The Walshes continued to own the Chateau de Serrant until some fifteen years ago, when at the death of Count Ludovic Walsh de Serrant, last of his line, he bequeathed it, along with his large fortune, to his first cousin, the Duke of la Tremolle, whose mother, the third wife of the late duke, had been prior to her marriage Valentin de la Tremolle de Serrant.

It would be useless to describe the historically interesting and artistically remarkable features of this grand old French chateau, where both the old and the new are so admirably blended in its guests, and which is filled with well-nigh priceless treasures, old masters, wonderful old furniture and panoplies, which are all arranged in the main building is finer than that of many a monarch's palace. The chateau is surrounded by the largest park in France, and is a grand staircase of century-old trees. In fact, the estate and its present owner are in every sense of the word worthy of one another, and the only one who is difficult to add anything more. The Duc de la Tremolle is not particularly friendly to the present royal pretensions of the Orleans, devoted to the legitimist cause represented by the late Comte de Chambord, he inherited a good deal of the prejudice always entertained by the Duke of Orleans, in fact, neither the duke nor his wife take any part in French political life.

(Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)

Voice of the People

Communications must not contain more than 300 words. Exceeded letters will be returned. No anonymous communications will be accepted. Stamped envelope, with the writer's address, must accompany every communication.

The Marshall House.
To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:
Sir,—There appears in The Times-Dispatch of this morning an editorial under the caption, "How to Save the Marshall House." In this editorial the following language is used: "There has been some talk about the Virginia Bar Association becoming the custodian of this historic home, but it has invariably ended in talk." In justice to the Virginia Bar Association, permit me to state that the Association has offered to buy the Marshall house from the city, and when that was declined, offered to preserve and maintain it as a lawyers' club, if the city was to consent thereto. This latter proposition was reported favorably by the Finance Committee of the Council, but was rejected by the Council.

The implied charge, therefore, contained in said editorial that the Virginia Bar Association had taken no active steps toward the preservation of the Marshall house is a mistake, and I trust that the impression created by said editorial will be corrected.

JNO. B. MICHOL.
Secretary of the Virginia State Bar Association.
April 15, 1910.

Poe and John Marshall.
To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:
Sir,—I called attention in my editorial of your columns to one of E. A. Poe's criticisms in Burton's Magazine, in which he mentioned Chief Justice Marshall as a "poor old man" of interest to Richmond and Virginia readers. I am pleased to note from the card of the R. A. Stewart in the issue of the 4th that the editors of the "Virginia Poe" have now discovered same, and will print in their proposed new edition of the Poe generally known that Poe had a close personal acquaintance with the Chief Justice, who aided him in his literary career. In Poe's criticism of "Judge Story's Discourse on Judge Marshall," in the Southern Literary Messenger, December 1835, he refers to the Chief Justice as "our great and lamented countryman, fellow-Virginian, neighbor and friend," for by all these names did a fortuitous conjuncture of circumstances, including his own kind and pitiless heart, expect him to give a personal reminiscence of the Judge, which it is to be regretted never appeared.

J. H. WHITTY.
Richmond, Va., April 4, 1910.
When we undertake to sell your merchandise through advertising, we are sure to get the best results. Richmond Advertiser, Mutual Building.